

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | | |
|--------------|--|-------------|---------------|
| Applicant : | Shunpei Yamazaki et al. | Ari Unit : | 2818 |
| Serial No. : | 10/754,701 | Examiner : | Dao H. Nguyen |
| Filed : | January 12, 2004 | Conf. No. : | 9100 |
| Title : | LIGHT EMITTING DEVICE AND ELECTRICAL APPLIANCE | | |

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF DECEMBER 14, 2006

Claims 40-109 are currently pending with claims 40, 47, 55, 66, 73, 81 and 89 being independent.

Claims 40-95 also have been rejected as being unpatentable over Forrest (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,360) in view of Kimura (U.S. Patent No. 6,518,941). Applicant again requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Forrest, Kimura, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests an electroluminescent element having an operation voltage of 10 V or less, as recited in each of the independent claims. Forrest, at col. 16, lines 22-25 and with respect to Fig. 6, notes that voltages of greater than 17 volts are required in order to obtain light emission. Kimura appears to be silent on the issue of the operation voltage. Accordingly, since neither Forrest or Kimura describes or suggests the recited operating voltage, any proper combination of Forrest and Kimura would also fail to do so. For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In response to this argument, the rejection notes that Fig. 6 of Forrest shows that certain quantum efficiencies (of greater than zero) are obtained at operating voltages of 10V or less. However, as set forth by Forrest at col. 16, lines 14-17, Fig. 6 of Forrest describes light emission of "a device without a phosphorescent emitter." Thus, even if Fig. 6 of Forrest discloses that light emission may be detected at 10V or less, this does **not** mean that Forrest discloses a device with an electroluminescence element whose operation voltage is 10V or less. Indeed, as previously noted, Forrest states, with respect to Fig. 6, that "there is no light at low to medium bias." (See Forrest at col. 16, lines 23-24.) In other words, Forrest indicates that any detected

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/754,701
Filed : January 12, 2004
Page : 2 of 2

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-276002 / US4942D1

light emission at low to medium bias is inconsequential and unsuitable for use in a display device. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The \$120 fee for the one month extension of time is being paid in connection with the filing of this paper on the Electronic Filing System (EFS). Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

4/13/07

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
/adt
40405405.doc



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640